

REMARKS

5 At the outset, the Applicant thanks the Examiner for his courtesy and assistance during an interview that took place on January 7, 2009.

Rejections Under 35 USC 101

10 Within the Office Action, Claims 1, 4-11, 13-15, 18-30, 48, 49, 51, 57, 58, 60, 62, 92, 93, and 96-98 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant submits herewith a set of claims that has been amended to overcome this rejection. Such amendments are consistent with a discussion of this issue held between the Applicant and the Examiner in the interview that took place on January 7, 2009. Accordingly, the issues with regard
15 to 35 U.S.C. 101 are overcome.

Rejections under 35 USC 102

20 Also within the Office Action, Claims 1, 4, 8-11, 15, 18-30, 48, 49, 51, 57, 58, 60, 62, 92, 93, and 96-98 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by United States Patent Application Publication Number 2003/020443 to Cullen (hereinafter referred to as "Cullen"). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because Claims 1, 4-10, 18-20 and 27-29, as now presented, contain additional limitations that are not present in Cullen, as discussed with the Examiner during the above-identified interview. In particular, independent claims
25 1, 30, and 92 are now limited to the generation of individualized compensation reports using a survey engine and a collaborative filtering engine. These limitations were added, as suggested by the Examiner.

Rejections under 35 USC 103

30 Also within the Office Action, Claims 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 for being unpatentable over Cullen further in view of U.S. Patent Application

Publication No. 2002/0133502 to Rosenthal (hereinafter referred to as "Rosenthal"). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because Claims 5-7, as now presented, contain additional limitations not found in either Cullen or Rosenthal, as discussed during the above-identified interview.

5

Also within the Office Action, Claims 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 for being unpatentable over Cullen further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,618,734 to Williams *et al* (hereinafter referred to as "Williams"). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because Claims 13 and 14, as now presented,
10 contain additional limitations not found in either Cullen or Williams, as discussed during the above-identified interview.

Conclusion

15

In view of the foregoing, the application was deemed to be in allowable condition and the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw her rejections and issue Notice of Allowance such that the application may timely pass to Issuance as United States Letters Patent.

20 Should the Examiner find it helpful, he is encouraged to contact Applicant's attorney, Michael A. Glenn at (650) 474-8400.

Respectfully submitted,

25



Michael A. Glenn

Reg. No. 30,176

Customer No. 22862

30